DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 184 177 CS 502 858

AUTHOR Prisbell, Marshall; Andersen, Janis F.
TITLE The Importance of Perceived Homophily, Uncertainty Reduction, Feeling Good, Safety, and Self-Disclosure in Interpersonal Relationships.
PUB DATE Nov 79
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (65th, San Antonio, TX, November 10-13, 1979).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Disclosure; *Identification (Psychology); Interpersonal Attraction; Predictor Variables; Safety; *Self Concept; Social Psychology; *Speech Communication
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Research; *Homophily

ABSTRACT

An investigation was undertaken to assess the relationship of the independent variables of perceived homophily to the dependent variables of uncertainty reduction, feeling good, and safety. In addition, the relationship of uncertainty reduction, feeling good, and safety was assessed to the dependent variables of self-disclosure. The sample consisted of 162 adults drawn from elementary and secondary school teachers, college students, child development specialists, and members of a community service organization. Each subject received a packet containing scales measuring perceived homophily, uncertainty reduction, feeling good, relational safety, and self-disclosure, and each was instructed to complete the scales with a given target person in mind. The results indicated that perceived attitude-value homophily had a moderately high independent predictive power concerning uncertainty reduction, feeling good, and safety. Perceived background homophily and perceived appearance homophily had little or no independent predictive power to those variables. In addition, the independent predictive power of uncertainty reduction, feeling good, and safety was low for self-disclosure variables. Feeling good was the single best predictor of self-disclosive communication. (Author/FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Marshall Prisbell
Department of Speech Communication
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588
(402)472-3348

Janis F. Andersen
Department of Speech Communication
West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Virginia 26506
(304)293-3905

The Importance of Perceived Homophily, Uncertainty Reduction, Feeling Good, Safety, and Self-Disclosure in Interpersonal Relationships

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Marshall Prisbell
Janis F. Andersen
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED184177

SO 12 895P

Abstract

This investigation assessed the relationship of the independent variables of perceived homophily to the dependent variables of: (1) uncertainty reduction, (2) feeling good, and (3) safety. Also, the relationship of uncertainty reduction, feeling good, and safety was assessed to the dependent variables of self-disclosure.

Results indicated that perceived attitude-value homophily has moderately-high independent predictive power concerning uncertainty reduction, feeling good, and safety. Perceived background homophily and perceived appearance homophily have little or no independent predictive power to those dependent variables. Also, the independent predictive power of uncertainty reduction, feeling good, and safety was low for self-disclosure variables. Feeling good was the single best predictor of self-disclosive communication, accounting for five percent of the variance in a self-disclosure variable.

Statement of the Problem

The process of developing, maintaining and escalating a human relationship is an important area of investigation for communication researchers. More specifically, there is interest in isolating those variables that predict continued human interaction and relationship development. Variables potentially predictive of relationship development are examined in this investigation. Before discussing these

variables, three assumptions implicit in the conceptualization of this investigation should be outlined.

First, interpersonal relationships maintain and develop as a process of reciprocated interactions (Knapp, 1978; Altman & Taylor, 1973; Altman, 1973; Newcomb, 1961; Thibaut & Kelly, 1959). Berger and Calabrese (1975) theorize that the maintenance and development of an ongoing relationship is a result of communication exchange. In short, communication is necessary for interactions and interactions imply operative communication processes.

A second characteristic of a continuing relationship is the development of intimacy (Knapp, 1978; Berger & Calabrese, 1975; Berger & Larimer, 1974; Larimer & Berger, 1974; Altman & Taylor, 1973; Berger, 1973b; Taylor, Altman & Wheeler, 1973; Cozby, 1972; Ehrlich & Graven, 1971). Berger and Calabrese (1975) suggest one potential causal mechanism in that continued interaction decreases uncertainty level and decreases in uncertainty level lead to increases in intimacy. Whatever the reason, previous research findings demonstrate that continued interaction generally leads to more intimate communication exchanges.

Third, self-disclosure is an essential component of a continuing intimate relationship (Wheeless, 1978; Pearce & Sharp, 1973; Altman & Taylor, 1973; Cozby, 1973; Jourard, 1959). Self-disclosure is the behavior which moves relationships into greater intimacy by definition (Taylor & Altman, 1966) and through reciprocation (Jourard & Richman, 1963). Thus, relationship development involves self-disclosive communication. These three assumptions provide the rationale for selecting the following variables for investigating relationship development.

Perceived Homophily

Perceived homophily is one variable predictive of continued interaction. Perceived homophily is "the degree to which pairs of individuals who interact are similar with respect to certain attributes, such as beliefs, values, education, social status, and the like" (Rogers & Bhowmik, 1971, p. 526). More recently, perceived homophily has been defined as a multidimensional construct assessing perceived similarity between people along the dimensions of attitude, background, value and appearance (McCroskey, Richmond, & Daly, 1975).

One of the demonstrated principles of human communication is that communication occurs most frequently between a source and a receiver who are alike, similar and homophilous (Rogers & Shoemaker, 1971). Lazarfeld and Merten (1954) point out that we are uncertain whether perceived homophily is the basis of choice for why an individual chooses to interact with someone or whether instead perceived homophily is the result of previous interaction. Regardless of causation, increases in perceived homophily are associated with increases in the frequency of interactions.

Perceived homophily not only leads to more frequent interaction but it also leads to more effective interaction (Rogers & Bhowmik, 1971). When source and receiver share common meanings, attitudes, and beliefs that are communicated through a mutual language, it follows that communication between them is likely to be more effective (Zettenberg, 1965).

Furthermore, not only does perceived homophily lead to more frequent and more effective interaction, but frequent and effective interaction also leads to greater perceived homophily (Rogers & Bhowmik, 1971). The circularity of this relationship is further explained by linking Rogers and Bhowmik's (1971) three propositions. As a homophilous source and receiver interact more frequently (Proposition 1), this communication

is relatively more effective (Proposition II), and therefore creates greater consensus and perceived similarity between them (Proposition III). This process is rewarding thus leading to a higher rate of continued and/or future interactions (Chambliss, 1965; Triandis, 1960). One can conclude that perceived homophily plays an important role in the development of ongoing and escalating interactions within an existing dyad.

Previous research has demonstrated that perceived homophily leads to more frequent and effective interaction. Therefore, variables which are associated with perceived homophily and frequent, effective interaction are important to isolate. Three variables are suggested: (1) uncertainty reduction, (2) feeling good, and (3) safety. It is proposed that these states are both a result of and a cause of continuing interaction in relationship development. Since perceived homophily has been previously demonstrated to be an excellent predictor of frequent, effective interaction, there is a reason to suspect that these variables and perceived homophily will be highly associated.

Correlates of Perceived Homophily

Uncertainty Reduction

During initial encounters individuals have relatively high levels of uncertainty about each other and their relationship (Berger & Calabrese, 1975). This high level of uncertainty is due to a large range of potentially appropriate alternative behaviors, making accurate prediction about another difficult (Berger & Larimer, 1974). Thus, Berger and Calabrese (1975) suggest that similarities along such dimensions as attitude, background, and conceptual style will lead to the reduction of uncertainty, while dissimilarities along such dimensions will lead to

increases in uncertainty (Axiom 6, p. 106). Research by Berger and Clatterbuck (1976) substantiated this relationship in that as perceived similarity increased, uncertainty as indexed by the CLUES-7 scale decreased.

Furthermore, Berger and Calabrese (1975) also suggest that amount of communication and similarity are positively related (Theorem 6, p. 108). In further support of this relationship, Festinger's (1954) social comparison theory posits that individuals affiliate (interact) more with similar others. Rogers and Bhowmik (1971) hold that greater perceived similarity between source and receiver produces not only more effective communication but also greater frequency of interaction. Because amount of communication and uncertainty reduction are positively related, these are additional arguments for the relationship between similarity and uncertainty reduction. Therefore, the following hypothesis was proposed:

H_1: Perceived homophily is significantly and inversely related to uncertainty reduction.

Feeling Good

"Feeling good" is a second potential correlate of perceived homophily. Feeling good is a temporarily enhanced self-concept derived from peak experiences (Maslow, 1968), positive experiencing (Landsman, 1973) and overall rewarding interactions. This notion is derived from the work of those who suggest that one may gain or lose self-regard during specific interactions with others regardless of an overall self-esteem level (Maslow, 1968; Rogers, 1959; Festinger, 1954). Measurement and further conceptual development for this construct are reported by Prisbell (1978).

A potential relationship between feeling good and perceived homophily can be derived from several research areas. Schachter (1959)

demonstrates that people prefer to affiliate with similar others, arguing that this affiliation is rewarding because it provides individuals with consensual validation for their beliefs. Festinger's (1954) social comparison theory also posits that individuals validate self-generated attitudes through interactions with others. Reference group theory (Pettigrew, 1967) holds that reference groups or individuals serve "comparative" functions whereby individuals compare themselves with others. Merton's (1957) earlier work suggested individuals seek reference groups based on potential rewards, thus choosing groups similar to themselves. Rogers (1959) identifies a need for self-regard which he argues leads individuals to seek the regard of others.

This body of research suggests individuals structure their interactions to derive feelings of self-worth. Since it is logical to conclude that homophilous people would be more likely to provide greater reinforcing validation, more positive regard, and a temporary heightening of self-concept, the following hypothesis was advanced:

H_2: Perceived homophily is significantly and positively related to feeling good.

Relational Safety

Relational safety is a third potential correlate of perceived homophily. Relational safety is that state which exists when relationships are perceived as safe, secure, straightforward, nonthreatening and logical.

Components of relational safety have been investigated in previous research under the rubic of interpersonal trust (cf. Wheeless, 1978; Wheeless & Grotz, 1975, 1977; Bridges, 1970; Berlo, Lemert & Mertz, 1969; Giffin, 1967; McCroskey, 1966; Deutsch, 1958, 1965; Hovland, Janis & Kelly, 1953). This research, however, has generally examined trust

as a measure of person perception rather than as an indicator of a relationship state.

Previous research on trust has not directly or empirically confirmed a relationship between perceived homophily and trust. However, the idea that greater perceived homophily would lead to greater trust appears consistent with research in both areas. Furthermore, one could argue that trust explains why perceived homophilous people are more effective in eliciting change in the innovative process (Radudkar, 1960). Using this reasoning, compounded with the primitive that individuals feel safer in environments where there is familiarity and similarity, the third hypothesis was advanced:

H_3: Perceived homophily is significantly and positively related to safety.

Correlates of Self-Disclosure

Self-Disclosure

The second phase of this investigation examined previously discussed relationship states (uncertainty reduction, feeling good, and safety) as correlates of self-disclosure. As discussed in the assumption for this conceptualization, self-disclosure is a behavior essential to continuing intimate relationships. Self-disclosure has been defined in various ways but most of them are conceptually similar (cf. Wheeless, 1978; Wheeless & Grotz, 1975, 1976, 1977, for a complete literature review of the area). In this investigation, self-disclosure is defined as "any message about the self that a person communicates to another. Consequently, any message or message unit may potentially vary in the degree of self-disclosure present depending upon the perception of the message by those involved" (Wheeless & Grotz, 1976, p. 338). Self-disclosure is

operationalized as a five dimensional construct: amount, positiveness-negativeness, honesty-accuracy, intent, and depth (Wheeless, 1976, 1978; Wheeless & Grotz, 1976).

Previous research in self-disclosure has isolated relatively few relational correlates. Reciprocity of disclosure (Cozby, 1972, 1973; Altman, 1973), increased disclosure over acquaintance time (Altman & Taylor, 1973; Newcomb, 1973) and greater mutual liking in disclosive relationships (Cozby, 1972) appear to be among the few consistent empirically demonstrated correlates of self-disclosure cited by Wheeless (1978). More recently, trust and solidarity have been correlated to self-disclosure (Wheeless, 1976, 1978; Wheeless & Grotz, 1975, 1977). Three additional potential correlates of self-disclosure are examined in this investigation.

Uncertainty Reduction

Berger and Calabrese (1975) concluded that high levels of uncertainty in a relationship cause decreases in the intimacy level of communication content, while low levels of uncertainty produce high levels of intimacy (Axion 4, p. 103). Since self-disclosure is a behavioral indicant of an intimate relationship (Wheeless, 1978; Altman & Taylor, 1973; Pearce & Sharp, 1973; Cozby, 1973; Jourard, 1959), one can conclude another possible axiom relationship: high levels of uncertainty in a relationship cause decreases in self-disclosure, while low levels of uncertainty produce high levels of self-disclosure. Therefore, the following hypothesis was investigated:

H_4: Uncertainty reduction is significantly and inversely related to self-disclosure.

Feeling Good

Another possible correlate of self-disclosive communication is feeling good. A relationship may maintain and escalate because dyadic members increase each other's level of feeling good (state self-concept). The assumption that continuing relationships lead to intimacy which is characterized by self-disclosure behaviors, leads one to conclude that feeling good is related to self-disclosure.

Previous research on the relationship between self-esteem and self-disclosure generally supports a positive relationship. However, some researchers report nonsignificant findings. Research in counseling found self-disclosure to be positively related to self-concept (Peterson, 1972; Doyne, 1969). Yet, other research with encounter groups failed to confirm a relationship between self-disclosure and self-concept (Keller, 1976; Peterson, 1975; Fernandez, 1975; Doyne, 1972). Research on college students has also produced both results. A positive correlation between self-disclosure and self-esteem was reported by many researchers (Dinardo, 1977; Green, 1976; Sparks, 1976; Jourard, 1971a; Shapiro, 1968; Mullaney, 1964), but several other researchers failed to find a relationship (Tolor, et al., 1975; Booth, 1975; Willingham, 1971).

Although previous research demonstrates a relationship between self-esteem and self-disclosure all studies have not found this relationship. Failure to find this relationship can in part be attributed to low power and methodological flaws. It should also be noted that previous research operationalized self-esteem as a trait variable while this investigation examines a temporary state of feeling good. Since self-disclosure behaviors are state-like, one would predict a more significant relationship between feeling good (state) and self-disclosure than exists for self-esteem

(trait) and self-disclosure. Based on previous research and the rationale presented for feeling good as a relationship escalator, the next hypothesis was advanced:

H_5: Feeling good is positively and significantly related to self-disclosure.

Relational Safety

Relational safety is a third potential correlate of self-disclosive communication. Since self-disclosive communication may be regarded as a risky behavior, the safety level one feels in a particular relationship should determine the extent to which self-disclosure behaviors exist. To date, no research has been found to support or deny this notion.

Safety is highly similar to the concept of trust with the main difference being that the unit of analysis for safety is the relationship while the unit of analysis for trust is the individual. Wheeless and Grotz (1977) report a general relationship between trust and self-disclosure (Cozby, 1973; Pearce & Sharp, 1973). Jourard (1971) argued for trust as an antecedent of willingness to disclose when stating that "self-disclosure follows an attitude of love and trust" (p. 5). Other research has also linked self-disclosure to perceived trustworthiness reporting moderate amounts of shared variance (Wheeless & Grotz, 1975, 1977; Pederson & Higbee, 1969; Mellinger, 1956). This previous research on trust and self-disclosure lead to the sixth hypothesis:

H_6: Safety is positively and significantly related to self-disclosure.

Furthermore, there is reason to believe that moderate relationships exist among the variables uncertainty reduction, feeling good, and safety. Therefore, the following hypothesis was also considered:

H_7: Uncertainty reduction, feeling good, and safety variables are significantly related to self-disclosure variables.

METHOD

Subject Selection and Procedures

This investigation had four diversified subject samples. These four subject samples were chosen for two reasons: (1) samples of adult subjects were preferred since it was assumed that older people would have more previous relationship experience, and (2) sample diversity was preferred since this would enhance generalizability of results.

Subject Sample

The first sample chosen for this investigation was 400 elementary and secondary education teachers throughout a large Eastern state who were enrolled in off-campus extension courses. The questionnaires were mailed to the extension students (N = 400) giving them explanatory information about the study. The return rate of 19% provided this investigation with 75 teachers in this sample.

The second sample was students from a large Eastern university enrolled in introductory speech communication classes during the summer semester. Questionnaires were distributed by the class instructor and participation was voluntary. Sixty-one students completed the questionnaire.

The third sample consisted of ten child-development professionals attending a communication workshop. Workshop members were asked to take any additional packets for people they knew such as spouse, co-worker, friend, etc. A total of 30 packets were distributed and 18 were mailed back completed.

The fourth sample consisted of 20 members of a local Lions Club. Questionnaires were distributed at a meeting and eight packets were returned through the mail. Thus, the total N for this investigation was 162.

Procedures

All subjects received a research packet containing scales measuring perceived homophily, uncertainty reduction, feeling good, relational safety, and self-disclosure. Other scales were in the packet but were not part of this investigation. Each packet instructed the subject to complete the scales with a given target person in mind. Fourteen target-persons were selected on the basis of their potential closeness or social distance from the subjects.[1] Each packet also contained a second target person to be used if the first one was not a known person to them. All directions were written in the packet and completed packets were returned anonymously through the mail, except for the student sample which was returned anonymously to the instructor.

Operationalizations of Predictor Variables

Criteria for Scale Construction and Validation

All scales were constructed and/or validated with three different but concurrent statistical considerations: item-total correlations, internal reliability estimates and factor analysis.

For all factor analysis an eigenvalue of 1.0 was established as a guideline for the extraction of an additional factor and the Scree procedure was employed in order to determine the number of "valid" factors present within the eigenvalue of 1.0 guideline. In all orthogonal factor analyses performed in this investigation, a factor was considered

meaningful if two or more items loaded on that factor above .60 and less than .40 on other factors. After the extraction of two or more items utilizing the 60/40 criterion, if an item failed to load .60 on any factor but had its highest loading account for twice the variance of the second highest loading, then the item was also considered to be part of that factor. In all oblique factor analyses performed in this investigation, a factor was considered meaningful if two or more items loaded on that factor above .40 and the factor loading accounted for twice the variance of any secondary loadings. Increased internal reliability was the ultimate consideration for determining factor structure in that any items which decreased reliabilities would be deleted from the scale. Dimensional structures consistent with conceptualization were sought but all other statistically meaningful structures were examined. Items failing to meet statistical criteria and not constituting another viable factor would be deleted.

Operationalization of Perceived Homophily

Perceived homophily was measured with a 16-item, seven-interval, semantic differential-type instrument developed by McCroskey, Richmond, and Daly (1975). Factor analysis of the 16-item scale demonstrated a three-factor solution: attitude-value homophily, background homophily, and appearance homophily. Reliabilities using Nunnally's (1967) internal reliability formula on each dimension of the perceived homophily measure were the following: attitude-value homophily = .90, background homophily = .73, and appearance homophily = .82 (see Table 1 for scale summary statistics).

Operationalization of Uncertainty Reduction

Scales measuring uncertainty reduction were developed specifically for this investigation. Previous literature by Berger and Clatterbuck (1976), Clatterbuck (1976), Clatterbuck and Turner (1978), and Lester (1978) suggest one possible measurement for uncertainty reduction, the Clatterbuck Uncertainty Evaluation Scale (CLUES, 1976). However, this scale was not suitable for this investigation for two reasons. First, the items did not meet the conceptualization of uncertainty reduction in this report. CLUES items assess a person's ability to predict specific things about another person and this report dealt with how knowledgeable and/or predictive one person was about an overall relationship with another person. Second, items such as "knowing a person's lucky number" did not seem to have face validity when analyzing "how well you know a person." A person may know another person quite well, but a lucky number may never have been a relevant topic of discussion in the relationship.

The uncertainty reduction instrument developed for this investigation was a ten-item, seven-interval, Likert-type measurement. Subjects were asked to indicate how certain/knowledgeable they were about the designated target person, in areas of behaviors, emotional states, feelings, and interests (see Figure A).

Factor analysis of the uncertainty reduction instrument produced two different viable factor structures that were interpretable (see Table 2). The rotated varimax orthogonal solution yielded a viable two-factor solution meeting the 1.0 eigenvalue criterion, accounting for 71% of the variance. Six items loaded on the first factor and four items on the second factor (see Table 2). The internal reliability for the first factor was .89 and for the second factor it was .92. However, since a

unidimensional scale was sought, the unrotated solution was examined and was slightly more reliable. Furthermore, all items loaded above .51 with all but one item loading above .74 on the first factor of the unrotated solution (see Table 2). An Alpha-Cronbach internal reliability estimate of .92 was obtained for the unidimensional scale. Therefore, the unidimensional scale was used in the hypotheses testing (see Table 1 for scale summary statistics and see Table 3 for item-total correlations).

Operationalization of Feeling Good

The feeling good measure developed for this study was a 14-item, seven-interval, semantic differential-type scale. Subjects were asked to indicate how they feel about themselves when relating to the designated target person (see Figure B).

Factor analysis of the feeling good instrument produced an unrotated unidimensional solution (see Table 4 for factor loadings) with no loading under .70 on the first factor. Only one factor had an eigenvalue above 1.0 and the one factor solution accounted for 72 percent of the variance of the items (see Table 4). Split-half internal reliability of .96 was computed (see Table 1 for scale summary statistics and see Table 3 for item-total correlations).

Operationalization of Relational Safety

A 12-item, seven-interval, semantic differential-type scale was developed to assess relational safety (see Figure B). Factor analysis of the safety instrument produced an unrotated unidimensional solution (see Table 5 for factor loadings) with all items loading above .55. One item, however, loaded higher on a second factor than on the first and it appeared to not be operating as conceptualized. Therefore, this item was deleted

and another factor analysis was performed (see Table 5). This unrotated solution yielded a unidimensional solution with all items loading above .55 with this solution accounting for 58% of the variance in the items (see Table 5). Split-half reliability of .90 was computed for the revised eleven-item instrument (see Table 1 for scale summary statistics and Table 3 for item-total correlations).

Operationalization of Criterion (Dependent) Variables

Operationalization of Self-Disclosure

Scales measuring reported self-disclosure consisted of 31, seven-interval, Likert-type statements (Wheeless, 1978). The instrument was reported to have five factors with adult populations. Factor reliabilities reported in a previous investigation (Wheeless, 1978) were: amount, .88; consciously intended disclosure, .85; positiveness-negativeness of revealed information, .91; honesty-accuracy, .87; and general depth or intimacy of disclosure, .84.

The Wheeless (1978) 31-item scale was submitted to a confirmatory oblique factor analysis. Confirmatory oblique factor analysis produced a reliable five-dimensional solution as previously demonstrated by Wheeless (1978). Reliabilities using Nunnally's (1967) internal reliability formula for each dimension of self-disclosure were: intended self-disclosure, .75; amount of disclosure, .85; postiveness-negativeness of disclosure, .85; depth of disclosure, .79; and honesty-accuracy of disclosure, .83.

Statistical Analysis

The alpha level for all significance tests was set at .05. Hypothesis 1 was tested by means of multiple regression analysis, with homophily as the predictor variables and uncertainty reduction as the criterion variable. Hypothesis 2 was tested by means of multiple regression analysis, with homophily as the predictor variables and feeling good as the criterion variable. Hypothesis 3 was tested by multiple regression analysis, with homophily as the predictor variables and safety as the criterion variable.

Hypothesis 4 was tested through a series of simple regression analyses, with uncertainty reduction as the predictor variable and each of the five dimensions of self-disclosure as the criterion variables. Hypothesis 5 was tested through a series of simple regression analyses, with feeling good as the predictor variable and each of the five dimensions of self-disclosure as the criterion variables. Hypothesis 6 was tested through a series of simple regression analyses, with safety as the predictor variable and each of the five dimensions of self-disclosure as the criterion variable. Hypothesis 7 was tested by a canonical correlation analysis. The uncertainty reduction, feeling good, and safety variables comprised one canonical variate and the five dimensions of self-disclosure comprised the other canonical variate.

Hypothesized Results

Hypothesis 1 was confirmed. Multiple regression analysis was computed for the predictor variables of perceived homophily to that of the criterion variable of uncertainty reduction. Perceived homophily accounted for 31 percent of the variance in uncertainty reduction ($F = 23.90$; $df = 3/158$; $p<.0001$). Simple regression analysis indicated that attitude-value

homophily accounted for 29 percent of the variance in uncertainty reduction ($r = .54$), background homophily accounted for 12 percent of the variance in uncertainty reduction ($r = .34$), and appearance homophily accounted for seven percent of the variance in uncertainty reduction ($r = .27$) (see Table 6 for correlation matrix).

In order to determine unique variance for each of the perceived homophily dimensions, partial regression coefficients were examined. Attitude-value homophily accounted for 16 percent of the unique variance in uncertainty reduction ($F = 36.79$; df 1/160; $p<.0001$), background homophily accounted for one percent of the unique variance in uncertainty reduction ($F = 2.98$; df = 1/160; $p<.04$), and appearance homophily accounted for less than one percent (.008 percent) of the unique variance in uncertainty reduction ($F = 1.85$; df = 1/160; $p<.085$).

Hypothesis 2 was confirmed. Multiple regression analysis was computed for the predictor variables of perceived homophily and the criterion variable of feeling good. Perceived homophily accounted for 45 percent of the variance in feeling good ($F = 43.16$; df = 3/158; $p<.0001$). Simple regression analysis demonstrated attitude-value homophily to account for 45 percent of the variance in feeling good ($r = .67$), background homophily accounted for nine percent of the variance in feeling good ($r = .30$), and appearance homophily accounted for five percent of the variance in feeling good ($r = .22$) (see Table 6 for correlation matrix).

In order to determine unique variance for each of the perceived homophily dimensions, partial regression coefficients were examined. Attitude-value homophily accounted for 34 percent of the unique variance in feeling good ($F = 97.40$; df = 1/160; $p<.0001$), background homophily accounted for less than one percent (.0003 percent) of the unique variance in feeling good ($F = .08$; df = 1/160; $p<.38$), and appearance homophily

accounted for less than 1 percent (0001 percent) of the unique variance in feeling good ($F = .04$; $df = 1/160$; $p<.42$).

Hypothesis 3 was confirmed. Multiple regression was computed for the predictor variables of perceived homophily to that of the criterion variable of safety. Perceived homophily accounted for 46 percent of the variance in safety ($F = 44.14$; $df = 3/158$; $p<.0001$). A simple regression analysis indicated that attitude-value homophily accounted for 44 percent of the variance in safety ($r = .66$), background homophily accounted for 9 percent of the variance in safety ($r = .31$), and appearance homophily accounted for 11 percent of the variance in safety ($r = .33$) (see Table 6 for correlation matrix).

In order to determine unique variance for each of the perceived homophily dimensions, partial regression coefficients were examined. Attitude-value homophily accounted for 29 percent of the unique variance in safety ($F = 85.83$; $df = 1/160$; $p<.001$), background homophily accounted for less than 1 percent (.0003 percent) of the unique variance in safety ($F = .08$; $df = 1/160$; $p<.39$) and appearance homophily accounted for 1 percent of the unique variance in safety ($F = 4.23$; $df = 1/160$; $p<.02$).

Hypothesis 4 consisted of five simple regressions testing the predictor variable of uncertainty reduction to the criterion variables of self-disclosure. Uncertainty reduction was significantly related to: honesty of self-disclosure ($F = 6.04$; $df = 1/156$; $p<.01$), accounting for 4 percent of the variance; amount of self-disclosure ($F = 4.08$; $df = 1/156$; $p<.02$), accounting for 2 percent of the variance; and depth of self-disclosure ($F = 2.85$; $df = 1/156$; $p<.05$), accounting for 2 percent of the variance. Uncertainty reduction was found to be non-significantly related to intent of self-disclosure ($F = 1.13$; $df = 1/156$; $p<.14$) and to positiveness-negativeness of self-disclosure ($F = 2.55$; $df = 1/156$; $p<.06$).

Hypothesis 5 consisted of five simple regressions testing the relationship between the predictor variable feeling good to the criterion variables of self-disclosure. Feeling good was significantly related to: depth of self-disclosure ($F = 8.95$; $df = 1/156$; $p<.002$), accounting for 5 percent of the variance; intent of self-disclosure ($F = 7.00$; $df = 1/156$; $p<.005$), accounting for 4 percent of the variance; honesty of self-disclosure ($F = 6.34$; $df = 1/156$; $p<.007$) accounting for 4 percent of the variance; and amount of self-disclosure ($F = 4.11$; $df = 1/156$; $p<.02$), accounting for 3 percent of the variance. Feeling good was found to be non-significantly related to positiveness-negativeness of self-disclosure ($F = 1.58$; $df = 1/156$; $p<.11$).

Hypothesis 6 consisted of five simple regressions testing the relationship between the predictor variable of safety to the criterion variable of self-disclosure. Safety was significantly related to: depth of self-disclosure ($F = 4.72$; $df = 1/156$; $p<.02$), accounting for 3 percent of the variance; amount of self-disclosure ($F = 3.27$; $df = 1/156$; $p<.04$), accounting for 2 percent of the variance; and honesty of self-disclosure ($F = 2.87$; $df = 1/156$; $p<.05$), accounting for 2 percent of the variance. Safety was found to be non-significantly related to intent of self-disclosure ($F = 2.15$; $df = 1/156$; $p<.08$) and to positiveness-negativeness of self-disclosure ($F = .08$; $df = 1/156$; $p<.40$).

Canonical correlation analysis produced one significant canonical relationship ($Rc = .35$; $X^2 = 27.70$; $df = 15/142$; $p<.03$) between the predictor variables in group one: uncertainty reduction, feeling good, and safety to the criterion variables of self-disclosure in group two to confirm hypothesis 7. The relationship between each of the first canonical variates is such that, twelve percent of the variance in the first set can be explained by the second set and vice versa. The canonical

coefficients for the variables of group one were: uncertainty reduction (.66), feeling good (.99), and safety (.66). The canonical coefficients for the variables of group two were: intent of self-disclosure (.59), amount of self-disclosure (.46), depth of self-disclosure (.65), honesty of self-disclosure (.59), and positiveness-negativeness of disclosure (.34) (see Table 7).

The main contributors for the group one variate were uncertainty reduction, feeling good, and safety. The main contributors for the group two variate were intent of self-disclosure, amount of self-disclosure, depth of self-disclosure, and honesty of self-disclosure. The redundancy index showed that uncertainty reduction, feeling good, and safety accounted for 8 percent of the shared variance, while the self-disclosure variables accounted for 4 percent of the shared variance.

Discussion

Several general conclusions can be drawn from the results of this investigation. Perceived homophily is a meaningful predictor of uncertainty reduction, feeling good, and safety. More specifically, perceived homophily accounted for thirty-one percent of the variance in uncertainty reduction. Moreover, attitude-value homophily accounted for sixteen percent of the unique variance in uncertainty reduction and attitude-value homophily alone accounted for twenty-nine percent of the variance. Background and appearance homophily accounted for one percent and less than one percent, respectively. This finding suggests that continuing interactions reduce uncertainty by means of perceived attitude-value similarities rather than by perceived background and/or appearce similarities.

Perceived homophily was also a good predictor of feeling good (state

self-concept), accounting for forty-five percent of the variance. Once again, perceived attitude-value homophily was the single best predictor of feeling good, accounting for thirty-four percent of the unique variance and alone accounting for forty-five percent of the variance. Perceived background and appearance homophily independently accounted for less than one percent of the variance in feeling good. This finding suggests that individuals seek out others who have similar attitudes to their own with an outcome of feeling temporarily heightened. Since being from a similar background or having a similar appearance was not related to feeling good, this also suggests that individuals go beyond initial impressions and rely on perceived attitude-value similarity as more salient in determining continued relationships.

Finally, perceived homophily was also a good predictor of relational safety, accounting for forty-six percent of the variance. Perceived attitude-value homophily accounted for twenty-nine percent of the unique variance in safety and perceived attitude-value homophily alone perdicted forty-four percent of the variance for safety. Again, perceived background and appearance homophily accounted for less than one percent and one percent of the variance, respectively. Thus, relational safety is a function of perceived attitude-value similarity rather than perceived background and/or appearance similarity.

Another general finding was that uncertainty reduction, feeling good, and safety were relatively poor predictors of all dimensions of self disclosure. None of these variables predicted more than five percent of the variance for any of the dimensions of self-disclosure. Furthermore, post hoc analysis demonstrated homophily to be a relatively poor predictor of self disclosure as well. A canonical analysis of the three dimensions of perceived homophily and the five dimensions of self disclosure produced

one significant canonical relationship (Rc = .33; X^2 = 30.70; df 15/142; p<.0097) accounting for a mutually predictive eleven percent variance. The hypothesized canonical relationship of uncertainty reduction, feeling good, and safety correlated with self-disclosure dimensions produced a canonical variable only accounting for 12 percent shared variance. All correlations with self-disclosure suggested little predictibility from the variables examined.

This limited predictibility for self-disclosure may be partially explained by reduced reliability for self-disclosure scales. The reliability for the self-disclosure scales was somewhat lower than had been previously reported. Since the self-disclosure scales were the last scales in a rather lengthy questionnaire, fatigue effects may have been operative in scale completion. Furthermore, the canonical correlation vector for self-disclosure was not adequate due to low correlations among the self-disclosure variables. Since the canonical correlation vector was created from variables which were poorly correlated, the vector was largely created from error variance and was not a good representation of the self-disclosure construct. Thus, it is not surprising that other vectors were not excellent predictors of an error-produced vector.

Future research needs to examine predictors of self-disclosure more fully. For example, if the 12 percent variance in self-disclosure that can be predicted from uncertainty reduction, feeling good, and relational safety is unique variance to self-disclosure then it is rather substantial. If, however, it is repetitious variance that can be equally well explained by trust or solidarity then the variance is less important and other more predictive variables need to be isolated.

The most significant imitation of the present research is the fact

that the nature of the study was strictly correlational. Even though a theoretical rationale argued for a time sequence in interpersonal relationship development, there is no causal analyses over time to directly support this relationship. From this study, all that can be interpreted are correlational relationships. Thus, future research should utilize competing causal models (e.g., path analysis) to determine the sequential causal nature of the variables operating in the relationship. This kind of research would also produce statements about how the role of these variables change in different stages of a relationship.

NOTES

1. The six closer target-persons were the following: (1) best male friend; (2) best female friend; (3) boyfriend/girlfriend/spouse; (4) father/mother; (5) brother/sister; and (6) co-worker.

The eight more distant target-persons were the following: (1) an acquaintance through an organization; (2) parent or one of your child's best friends; (3) supervisor/boss; (4) neighbor; (5) disliked person; (6) subordinate; (7) minister/priest/rabbi; and (8) doctor.

Many of the closer targets include those used by Jourard (1964, 1971) in his research or were suggested by Brown (1965, p. 58) as persons with whom we are more likely to have solidarity. The more distant targets included a number of persons whose social roles encourage disclosure from others. In addition, an attempt was made to avoid highly distant sources that would be unrealistic for validating the concept of self-disclosure (e.g., the President, the Pope, etc.).

REFERENCES

Altman, I. Reciprocity of interpersonal exchange. Journal of the Theory of Social Behavior, 1973, 3, 249-261.

Altman, I. & Taylor, D. A. Social penetration: The development of interpersonal relationships. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1973.

Berger, C. R. The acquaintance process revisited: Explorations in initial interaction. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Speech Communication Association, New York, November 1973(b).

Berger, C. R. & Calabrese, R. J. Some explorations in initial interaction and beyond: Toward a developmental theory of interpersonal communication. Human Communication Research, 1975, 1, 99-112.

Berger, C. R. & Larimer, M. W. When beauty is only skin deep: The effects of physical attractiveness, sex, and time on initial interaction. Paper presented at the annual convention of the International Communication Association, New Orleans, April 1974.

Berger, C. R. & Clatterbuck, G. W. Attitude similarity and attributional information as determinants of uncertainty reduction and interpersonal attraction. Paper presented at the annual convention of the International Communication Association, Portland, Oregon, April 1976.

Berlo, D. K., Lemert, J. B. & Mertz, R. J. Dimensions for evaluating the acceptability of message sources. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1969, 33, 563-579.

Booth, R. E. Self-disclosure and personality adjustment. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 35, (11-b), 5633.

Bridges, J. G. Validation of a theory of interpersonal trust behavior. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 31, (1-A), 462-463.

Brown, R. Social psychology. New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Chambliss, W. J. The selection of friends. Social Forces, 1965, 43, 370-380.

Clatterbuck, G. W. Attributional confidence, uncertainty reduction, and attraction in initial interaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1976.

Clatterbuck, G. W. & Turner, G. O. Short-term and long-term effects of information, physical attractiveness, and uncertainty reduction on relationship development. Paper presented at the annual convention of the International Communication Association, Chicago, April 1978.

Cozby, P. Self-disclosure, reciprocity, and liking. Sociometry, 1972, 35, 151-160.

Cozby, P. Self-disclosure: A literature review. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 79, 73-91.

Deutsch, M. Trust and suspicion. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 1958, 2, 265-279.

Deutsch, M. Trust and suspicion. In Bornland, D. C. (ed.), Interpersonal communication: Survey and studies. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965.

Dinardo, T. A. The effects of self-esteem, threat, and closeness on sharing a negative impression. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 37, (8-b), 4215.

Doyne, S. E. Effects of a sensitivity training laboratory experience on self-disclosure, self-esteem, and social desirability. Unpublished master's thesis, George Peabody College, 1969. In Thompson, W. (ed.), Correlates of the Self-Concept. Nashville, Tenn.: The Dede Wallace Center, 1972, 62-63.

Doyne, S. E. The relationship between the self-disclosure and self-esteem in encounter groups. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33, (4-b), 1786.

Ehrlich, H. J. & Graeven, D. B. Reciprocal self-disclosure in a dyad. Journal of Experimental and Social Psychology, 1971, 7, 389-400.

Fernandez, E. B. A study of changes in measured self-concept, self-disclosure, and attitudes towards family life as a result of the use of a socialization technique before and during psycho-therapy. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 36 (6-b), 3034.

Festinger, L. A. A theory of social comparison. Human Relations, 1954, 14, 48-61.

Giffin, K. The contributions of studies of source credibility to a theory of interpersonal trust in the communication process. Psychological Bulletin, 1967, 68, 104-120.

Green, R. B. Self-disclosure, self-esteem, and perceived similarity. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 36, (10-b), 5232.

Hovland, C. I., Janis, I. L., & Kelly, H. H. Communication and persuasion. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.

Jourard, S. M. Self-disclosure and other-cathexis. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 59, 428-431.

Jourard, S. M. The transparent self. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1964.

Jourard, S. M. The transparent self. Princeton: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1971.

Jourard, S. M. Self-disclosure: An experimental analysis of the transparent self. New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1971(a).

Jourard, S. M. & Richman, P. Disclosure output and input in college students. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1963, 9, 141-148.

Keller, M. E. Self-disclosure as a function of self-esteem and repression-sensitization. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 36, (6-b), 3127-3128.

Knapp, M. L. Social intercourse: From greeting to goodbye. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1978.

Landsman, T. Unpublished manuscript, University of Florida, 1973. In Jourard, S. M., Healthy Personality, New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc., 1974.

Larimer, M. W. & Berger, C. R. Interpersonal compatibility and the development of interpersonal relationships. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, Illinois, December 1974.

Lazarsfeld, P. F. & Merton, R. K. Friendship as a social process: A substantive and methodological analysis. In Berger, M. (ed.), Freedom and Control in Modern Society, New York: Van Nostrand, 1954.

Lester, R. E. Beyond initial interaction: Dyadic communication behavior and uncertainty reduction in personal phase relationships. Paper presented at the annual convention of the International Communication Association, Chicago, April 1978.

Maslow, A. H. Toward a psychology of being, 2nd edition. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1968.

McCroskey, J. C. Scales for the measurement of ethos. Speech Monographs, 1966, 33, 65-72.

McCroskey, J. C., Richmond, V. P., & Daly, J. A. The development of a measure of perceived homophily in interpersonal communication. Human Communication Research, 1975, 1, 323-332.

Mellinger, G. D. Interpersonal trust as a factor in communication. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1956, 52, 304-309.

Merton, R. Social theory and social structure (revised edition). Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957.

Mullaney, A. J. Relationships among self-disclosure behavior, personality, and family interaction. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1964, 24 (10-b), 4290.

Newcomb, T. M. The acquaintance process. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Nunnally, J. C. Psychometric theory. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Pearce, W. B. & Sharp, S. M. Self-disclosing communication. Journal of Communication, 1973, 23, 409-425.

Pederson, D. M. & Higbee, K. L. Self-disclosure and relationship to the target person. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1969, 15, 213-220.

Peterson, D. J. The relationship between self-disclosure and self-concept of under-achieving college students in group counseling. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33, (5-b), 2354.

Peterson, R. E. The effects of self-disclosure on self-esteem in a group of low-income clients. Disseration Abstracts International, 1975, 36, (6-b), 3127-3128.

Pettigrew, T. Social evaluation theory: Convergences and applications. In Levine, D. (ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1967, 15, 241-311.

Prisbell, M. Feeling good: Conceptualization and measurement. Paper contributed at the annual meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association Convention, Los Angeles, 1979.

Radudkar, W. B. Local leaders and the adoption of form practices. In Rogers, E. M. & Shoemaker, F. F., Communication of Innovations. New York: The Free Press, 1971.

Rogers, C. Therapy, personality and interpersonal relationships. In Koch, S. (ed.), Psychology: A study of science. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Rogers, E. M. & Showmik, D. K. Homophily-Heterophily: Relational concepts for communication research. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1971, 34, 523-538.

Rogers, E. M. & Shoemaker, F. F. Communication of Innovations. New York: The Free Press, 1971.

Schachter, S. The psychology of affiliation: Experimental studies of the sources of gregariousness. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959.

Shapiro, A. The relationship between self-concept and self-disclosure. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1968, 29, (3-b), 1180-1181.

Sparks, D. C. Self-disclosure and its relationship to self-concept among students in a selected high school. Disseration Abstracts International, 1976, 37 (3-a), 1412.

Taylor, D. A. & Altman, I. Intimacy scaled stimuli for use in studies of interpersonal relationships, 1966. In Altman, I. & Taylor, D. A. Social penetration: The development of interpersonal relationships. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1973.

Taylor, D. A., Altman, I., & Wheeler, L. Self-disclosure in isolated groups. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 26, 39-47.

Thibaut, J. W. & Kelly, H. H. The social psychology of groups. New York: Wiley, 1959.

Tolor, A., Cramer, M., D'Amico, D., & O'Marra, M. M. The effects of self-concept, trust, and imagined positive or negative self-disclosures on psychological space. Journal of Psychology, 1975, 89, 9-24.

Triandis, H. C. Cognitive similarity and communication in a dyad. Human Relations, 1960, 13, 175-183.

Wheeless, L. R. Self-disclosure and interpersonal solidarity: Measurement, validation, and relationships. Human Communication Research, 1976, 3, 47-61.

Wheeless, L. R. A follow-up study of relationships of trust, disclosure, and interpersonal solidarity. Paper presented at the annual convention of the International Communication Association, Berlin, 1977.

Wheeless, L. R. A follow-up study of the relationships among trust, disclosure, and interpersonal solidarity. Human Communication Research, 1978, 4, 143-157.

Wheeless, L. R. & Grotz, J. Self-disclosure and trust: Conceptualization, measurement, and interrelationships. Paper presented at the annual convention of the International Communication Association, Chicago, April 1975.

Wheeless, L. R. & Grotz, J. Conceptualization and measurement of reported self-disclosure. Human Communications Research, 1976, 3, 338-346.

Wheeless, L. R. & Grotz, J. The measurement of trust and its relationship to self-disclosure. Human Communications Research, 1977, 3, 250-257.

Willingham, M. E. The relationship between self-concept, self-disclosure, and peer selection. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 32, (8-a), 4365.

Zetterberg, H. L. On theory and verification in sociology. Totorva, New Jersey: Bedminster Press, 1965.

FIGURE A

Uncertainty Reduction Measure

Please fill out the following scale to indicate how certain/knowledgeable you are about the designated person.

How well can you predict this person's behavior?
Extremely well:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:Not at all

How well do you know this person?
Not at all:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:Extremely well

How well can you predict this person's emotional states?
Extremely well:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:Not at all

How well do you understand this person's feelings?
Extremely well:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:Not at all

How well can you predict this person's decisions?
Extremely well:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:Not at all

How well do you know this person's interests?
Not at all:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:Extremely well

How well can you predict this person's attitudes/values?
Not at all:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:Extremely well

How well do you know this person's likes/dislikes?
Not at all:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:Extremely well

How well do you understand this person's judgments?
Extremely well:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:Not at all

How well can you predict this person's responses?
Not at all:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:Extremely well

FIGURE B

State Relational Safety Measure

Please check the appropriate space on each item which you think best describes the nature of the relationship between you and the designated person.

(36)	safe:	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	:unsafe
(37)	irrational:	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	:rational
(38)	insecure:	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	:secure
(39)	sure:	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	:unsure
(40)	vulnerable:	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	:invulnerable
(41)	threatened:	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	:unthreatened
(42)	straightforward:	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	:tricky
(43)	not deceptive:	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	:deceptive
(44)	restricted:	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	:not restricted
(45)	unguarded:	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	:guarded
(46)	logical:	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	:illogical
(47)	able to be harmed:	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	:not able to be harmed

State Feeling Good Measure

Please check the appropriate space on each item to best reflect how you feel about yourself when you are relating to the designated person.

(48)	good:	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	:bad
(49)	valuable:	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	:worthless
(50)	positive:	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	:negative
(51)	admirable:	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	:deplorable
(52)	happy:	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	:sad
(53)	gloomy:	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	:cheerful
(54)	unpleasant:	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	:pleasant
(55)	interesting:	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	:uninteresting
(56)	satisfied:	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	:unsatisfied
(57)	attractive:	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	:unattractive
(58)	confident:	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	:not confident
(59)	exuberant:	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	:repressed
(60)	capable:	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	:incapable
(61)	heightened:	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	:reduced

TABLE 1

Scale Summary Statistics

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Internal Reliability
Attitude-value Homophily	162	37.52	11.17	.90
Background Homophily	162	18.76	6.01	.73
Appearance Homophily	162	12.35	6.35	.82
Uncertainty Reduction	162	53.56	11.90	.92
Feeling Good	162	80.99	15.75	.96
Safety	162	58.89	11.52	.90
Intended Self-Disclosure	158	21.56	3.62	.75
Amount of Self-Disclosure	158	24.07	8.37	.86
Positiveness-Negativeness of Self-Disclosure	158	34.89	7.09	.85
Depth of Self-Disclosure	158	14.93	5.88	.79
Honesty of Self-Disclosure	158	39.90	7.97	.83

TABLE 2
Initial Unrotated Factor Matrix
for Two-Factor Solution Uncertainty Reduction

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Item 1	-.76	.28
Item 2	.75	-.15
Item 3	-.80	.37
Item 4	-.82	.22
Item 5	-.82	.27
Item 6	.83	.39
Item 7	.76	.50
Item 8	..83	.40
Item 9	-.51	.44
Item 10	.78	.28

Rotated Orthogonal Factor Matrix
for Two-Factor Solution Uncertainty Reduction

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Item 1	-.74	-.34
Item 2	.63	.42
Item 3	-.83	-.30
Item 4	-.74	-.42
Item 5	-.78	-.38
Item 6	.31	.87
Item 7	.19	.89
Item 8	.31	.87
Item 9	-.67	-.05
Item 10	.36	.75

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Eigenvalues	5.94	1.20
Cumulative percentage of Eigenvalues	.59	.71

TABLE 3

Item-total Correlations

Safety		Feeling Good	
Item 1	-.84	Item 1	-.87
Item 2	.81	Item 2	-.86
Item 3	.88	Item 3	-.89
Item 4	-.85	Item 4	-.83
Item 5	.38	Item 5	-.90
Item 6	.75	Item 6	.88
Item 7	-.81	Item 7	.91
Item 8	-.69	Item 8	-.75
Item 9	.64	Item 9	-.88
Item 10*	---	Item 10	-.71
Item 11	-.73	Item 11	-.83
Item 12	.67	Item 12	-.85
		Item 13	-.82
		Item 14	-.85

Item 1	-.74
Item 2	.74
Item 3	-.79
Item 4	-.82
Item 5	-.81
Item 6	.84
Item 7	.76
Item 8	.83
Item 9	-.54
Item 10	.78

* Item 10 omitted from study.

TABLE 4

Initial Unrotated Factor Matrix
for Two-Factor Solution Feeling Good

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Item 1	.87	-.19
Item 2	.86	.07
Item 3	.90	-.17
Item 4	.83	-.21
Item 5	.90	-.22
Item 6	-.88	.20
Item 7	-.91	.17
Item 8	.74	.33
Item 9	.88	-.03
Item 10	.70	.55
Item 11	.82	.32
Item 12	.84	.09
Item 13	.82	.10
Item 14	.85	-.07
	Factor 1	Factor 2
Eigenvalues	10.03	.78
Cumulative percentage of Eigenvalues	.72	.77

TABLE 5
Initial Unrotated Factor Matrix
for Two-Factor Solution Safety

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Item 1	.87	.19
Item 2	-.84	-.13
Item 3	-.89	-.09
Item 4	.87	.05
Item 5	-.56	.20
Item 6	-.76	.002
Item 7	.81	.28
Item 8	.67	.05
Item 9	-.63	.55
Item 10*	.60	-.61
Item 11	.72	.34
Item 12	-.65	.12

* Item failed to meet criterion.

Initial Unrotated Factor Matrix
for Two-Factor Solution Safety

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Item 1	-.88	-.04
Item 2	.84	-.02
Item 3	.90	.10
Item 4	-.87	-.06
Item 5	.56	.55
Item 6	.77	.27
Item 7	-.82	.27
Item 8	-.66	.45
Item 9	.61	.28
Item 11	-.73	.42
Item 12	.64	-.04
	Factor 1	Factor 2
Eigenvalues	6.37	.92
Cumulative percentage of Eigenvalues	.58	.66

TABLE 6

Correlation Coefficient Matrix

	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
(1) Uncertainty Reduction	.62	.59	.54	.34	.27	.08*	.16	.13*	.13*	.19
(2) Feeling good		.76	.67	.30	.22	.21	.16	.10*	.23	.20
(3) Safety			.66	.31	.33	.12*	.14*	.02*	.17	.13*
(4) Attitude-Value Homophily				.42	.31	13*	.23	-.03*	.25	.13*
(5) Background Homophily					.26	.11*	.15*	.16	.03*	.13*
(6) Appearance Homophily						.04*	.06*	.12*	.11*	.01*
(7) Intent of Self-Disclosure							-.03*	.21	-.07*	.46
(8) Amount of Self-Disclosure								-.04*	.59	-.07
(9) Positiveness-Negativeness of Self-Disclosure									.002*	.32
(10) Depth of Self-Disclosure										-.05*
(11) Honesty of Self-Disclosure										

N = 158 for all correlations with self-disclosure variables and
N = 162 for all other correlations

*Not statistically significant at .05 level, p<.05.

TABLE 7

Canonical Correlations

Canonical Variables	Canonical Correlations	Chi-Square	DF	Prob Chi-Square
1	.35	27.70	15	.0235
2	.20	7.43	8	.4908
3	.09	1.40	3	.7091

Correlation Coefficients Between
Each Canonical Variable of Group 1

Canonical	Uncertainty Reduction	Safety	Feeling Good
Var #1	.66	.66	.99
Var #2	-.73	-.02	.08
Var #3	.18	.75	.15

Correlation Coefficients Between
Each Canonical Variable of Group 2

Canonical	Intent of Self Disclosure	Amount of Self Disclosure	Positiviness-Negativeness of Self Disclosure	Depth of Self Disclosure	Honesty of Self Disclosure
Var #1	.59	.46	.34	.65	.59
Var #2	.34	-.31	-.43	.16	-.40
Var #3	-.27	.50	-.82	.29	-.06